

City of Taylorsville  
Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes  
Tuesday – June 28, 2005 – 6:00 P.M.  
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

---

**Attendance:**

**Planning Commission**

Angelo Calacino, Chair  
Blaine Smith  
Ted Jensen  
Aimee Newton  
Kristie Overson  
Phil Hallstrom  
Dama Barbour  
Excused: Joan Rushton-Carlson

**Community Development Staff**

Mark McGrath, Director  
Michael Maloy, City Planner  
Jean Gallegos, Secretary/Recorder

**PUBLIC:** Jack Lucas, Gary Penrose

**WELCOME:** Angelo welcomed those present, explained the process to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**MINUTES:** Review/approval of Minutes for May 10, 2005.

**MOTION:** [18:14:11](#) By motion of [Commissioner Overson](#) and second by [Commissioner Hallstrom](#), the Minutes for May 10, 2005 were approved on the consent agenda.

**VOTE:** All Commissioners voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

**WORK SESSION**

2. Discussion of pending high density residential development on 5.39 acres of property at 1276 West, 1286 West and 1290 West Winchester Street; 6615 South, 6647 South and 6657 South 1300 West, in a R-M (Residential Multi-Family) Zone. (Michael Maloy/City Planner)

2.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. [18:14:51](#) **Mr. Maloy** indicated this project was discussed during the design charrette held earlier in this day at City Hall. Also that he had been working with the developer, Jack Lucas, on three or four conceptual design flaws, the primary one being defining community with architecture. Staff would prefer the backs of the buildings not being oriented towards the street and would like to lessen the impact of the garage element. There have also been issues with access to water and sewer for this entire site, which must be resolved between the developers, Taylorsville-Bennion Improvement District and Murray City. There also needs to be more green space designed into the project. **Mr. Maloy** said that Jack Lucas is in the audience and is available for questions.

2.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Jack Lucas**. [18:23:31](#) **Mr. Lucas** advised that the discussions he had with staff were very helpful and he realized that good architecture means good business. He felt this will be a premier project in Taylorsville.

- [18:23:57](#) **Commissioner Hallstrom** was concerned over the regular linear street pattern of this project and would have liked to have seen more clustering within the development. He realized that would reduce the number of units but would make it far more aesthetically pleasing and marketable. **Mr. Lucas** addressed the issue of clustering by saying that they were trying to develop the project in conjunction with the owners of the property on the corner, however, it is not a joint ownership, therefore, each project must stand alone. He also said that the "L" shape of their site does not allow a great deal of flexibility on street design and therefore on clustering. While he usually liked to see the clustering in a development, he felt it would not work on this site. **Commissioner Hallstrom** [18:28:35](#) then suggested a cul-de-sac could alleviate some of

the problems, however, that would create a reduction in the number of units. **Mr. Lucas** said his concern about a cul-de-sac is that it would not allow their project any access from Winchester Street.

- **18:29:57 Commissioner Barbour** said she thought they were reviewing the entire five acre parcel with one owner. **Mr. Lucas** said he was the authorized agent for two owners of the five acre parcel but can only make decisions on his "L" shaped piece. **Commissioner Hallstrom 18:30:44** said to keep in mind that the Commission is reviewing the conceptual plan for the entire five acre site this evening, whether they develop the whole thing or not.
- **18:31:17 Commissioner Calacino** said that this project involves two different owners who cannot come to agreement, which is forcing a change in design. He felt it would be more sensible for them to come together and make it a nice project at the gateway to the City. If the Commission allows the project to develop as proposed this evening, it will look like separate projects and won't be cohesive if developed this way. **Mr. Lucas** commented that he does not have the ability to force the other developer to comply.
- **18:33:03. Commissioner Barbour** advised that the Commission is reviewing this as one project and the developers are moving ahead as it being two projects. There needs to be some common ground established here.
- **18:33:36 Commissioner Newton** suggested that more be done with the corner piece, such as nice landscaping, including flowers and shrubs, to alleviate somewhat the concern about the homes backing to the street. **Mr. Lucas** said that is part of the reason he is trying to represent both projects and had met with them at length in order to make this work. He felt Commissioner Newton's comment about landscaping was valid and would soften the look of the homes that back to the street. He agrees there still is a challenge but that it will be a very nice project for all concerned.
- **18:38:18. Commissioner Overson** asked for clarification relative to the two different parcels with two separate owners and if it meant part of the site would be developed now and the rest later. **Mr. Lucas** said that the goal is for the whole site to be developed at the same time. **Commissioner Overson 18:40:16** continued that it is important to establish high quality landscaping along Winchester and 1300 West so that people will feel comfortable to walk along there. It would also be desirable to encourage Murray City to continue that effect west along Winchester.
- **18:41:30 Commissioner Calacino** said that he is supportive of most elements of this project but that it is important that the two property owners work together and listen to constructive suggestions being given by Planning Commissioners.

3. Discussion of pending mixed use development on 1.56 acres of property located at 1590- 1632 West 6235 South in a MD-3 (Mixed Development) zone. (Michael Maloy/City Planner)

3.1 **18:51:47 Mr. Maloy** advised that this property was not discussed during the design charrette earlier in this day at City Hall, however, a lot of the same design principles will apply for this site, in an obviously different form. The property along 6235 South is much smaller, being 1.5 acres. He mentioned that there was a lot of discussion during the rezone stage of this project as to whether or not to include a zoning condition. It was ultimately decided by the City Council to not include any zoning conditions because, staff was looking at basically one third of the overall property during the rezone. The developer will end up re-platting this property, which would create two zones and be inconsistent. Also, the MD-3 zone does contain a number of fairly restrictive zoning land uses already, as far as not allowing great traffic generators and limits the use to low intensity type retail. Staff is looking at a land use in an MD-3 zone. The challenge is that in order for the developer to bring some type of residential development to this project of any density they would be interested in, they must bring in a commercial project to the property. The residential must be basically an accessory use to the commercial, which has not been fully explored to this point.

3.2 **SPEAKING: 18:54:04 Chet Nichols** (Lives in this area and is a partner in this project). **Mr. Nichols** advised that he had spoken before the City Council in an effort to explain that when this site was zoned MD-3 it was one large parcel and since then has been divided into three parcels (credit union, a dentist office and the third a buffer. He felt that this would make a good quality gated community similar to the pocket communities established near the Cottonwood Mall area along Hyland Drive, with substantial landscaping to buffer it from the road. **Commissioner Hallstrom** advised he had seen the projects Mr. Nichols referred to along Hyland Drive and agreed that they were extremely nicely done and would be a good fit in this area.

- **Commissioner Hallstrom** [18:57:46](#) commended Mr. Nichols for speaking this evening. He said that during previous meetings relative to this project, the neighbors expressed concern about the traffic situation and the concern that this would negatively impact an already bad situation. **Mr. Nichols** commented that he lives in this area and wants it to be a nice project.
- **Commissioner Newton** [18:59:58](#) asked about the possibility of having just offices there and **Mr. Maloy** said that was staff's proposal in working with these developers. The MD zone is mixed use, however, staff would not oppose an office development there. The preference, however, would be a truly mixed use development.
- **Commissioner Jensen** [19:05:36](#) said that Taylorsville has a lot of home occupations and wanted to know if that had been planned for this development. **Commissioner Calacino** [19:06:24](#) felt that the mixed development use would apply, with the first floor being commercial and the second floor being residential.
- **Mr. Nichols** [19:06:43](#) advised they checked into that and statistics show that most mixed developments at some point end up in bankruptcy. **Mr. Lucas** asked if the Planning Commission position was against having this be an entirely residential area and **Commissioner Calacino** [19:08:22](#) advised that the ordinance requires it to be part commercial.
- **Commissioner Newton** [19:09:19](#) indicated to the developer that what is approved will depend upon the design that is submitted by the developer. **Commissioner Calacino** [19:10:08](#) felt the developer should design the project within the constraints of the MD-3 zoning, with a combination of uses.
- **Mr. Lucas** thanked the Commissioners for their input.

<p>4. 24C05 <b>Gary Penrose, 6300 and 6310 South Redwood Road</b> - Carpet Store and Warehouse. (Conceptual) (Michael Maloy/City Planner)</p>
---

4.1 [19:13:00](#) **Mr. Maloy** oriented on site plan and aerial map. He advised this is for conceptual review, however, that the Commission is very familiar with this proposal. He commented that this property is located at the south end of the City limits, Aspen Reception Center is to the west, a commercial endeavor to the north and to the east there is residential which will eventually be developed to commercial. This proposed site will have good visibility along Redwood Road and the site plan is completed.

- **Commissioner Calacino** [19:25:01](#) suggested that under the PUD ordinance, there is flexibility to allow the front setback at 16', however, by moving the building to the west 4', the applicant could achieve the required 20'. **Mr. Maloy** said that the area is very tight and he was not sure that could be done with the present footprint but that he would check into it.
- **Commissioner Barbour** [19:28:00](#). The applicant has proposed a 16' setback and the landscape setback from the sidewalk is actually 26', so the Department of Transportation owns the right-of-way. So there is 26', part of which is a right-of-way. Should that be completely landscaped then? **Mr. Maloy** said that the requirement that the adjacent property owner would develop the park strip, the sidewalk and the landscaping in that area. The typical is a standard 5' park strip and a 4' walk, which is not possible with this property. It is anticipated that would need to be re-built to comply with the current ordinance or potentially like was done with the Redwood Dental building where a wider meandering sidewalk was included. Staff would like to see it totally landscaped and the park strip improved.
- **Commissioner Jensen** [19:29:27](#) pointed out that with regard to signage, everywhere around it there is the cemetery or professional office, therefore, he would like to see the signage consistent with those uses. **Mr. Maloy** advised that a sign plan is a requirement for final approval of the project, so the Commission will see that. That Mr. Penrose has also offered to allow the City to install a type of gateway sign on his property, which shows he is willing to work with staff on that issue. [19:30:37](#)

4.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS: Curtis Minor (Architect) and Gary Penrose (Owner).** [19:31:37](#). **Mr. Minor** [19:33:49](#) advised that they are willing to work with staff to make this site work and the amount of available parking is an issue, along with adjustment being needed for the sidewalk. When Mr. Penrose brought the project to Mr. Minor, together they checked the zoning ordinance and felt the PUD would be the best way to proceed. Neither of them want the building to look like a warehouse and feel the proposed design is a very nice building for this site.

- **Commissioner Hallstrom** [19:36:28](#) complimented the applicants on the significant changes they have made to the plan since the last meeting to make it better.
- **Commissioner Overson** [19:37:06](#) asked what accommodations would be made for the delivery trucks to access the building. **Mr. Penrose** informed her that the usual delivery trucks were small enough to be easily accommodated and that UDOT is open to allow them to have a 25' radius for the larger trucks that come occasionally. **Commissioner Overson** [19:38:24](#) was also concerned about the impact this will have on the reception center behind it. **Mr. Penrose** advised that their business would close at 6:00 p.m. and probably would not overlap.
- **Commissioner Overson** asked about the landscaping, especially along the north side where the ten parking stalls are located. **Mr. Minor** said the landscaping was downsized there to allow flexibility for the trucks. **Mr. Penrose** [19:39:45](#) said that Popular trees would be planted to soften the noise and that they were amenable to making this work.
- **Commissioner Barbour** [19:41:39](#) complimented the applicant on the changes made and was pleased with the result.
- **Commissioner Smith** [19:42:55](#) said that the applicant has done a great job overcoming unique challenges associated with this site.
- **Commissioner Calacino** [19:43:16](#) agreed that it has come a long way but asked that the façade to the north be dressed up a little more and felt there still was an issue on the appropriate type of fencing needed. His preference was block or something solid at 6' in height. Also he appreciated applicant's endeavors to assure that that delivery trucks are accommodated on site.
- **Commissioner Newton** [19:48:35](#) suggested that the impacted neighbors be contacted to see what their preference would be regarding the type and height of fencing.
- **Mr. Penrose** thanked the Commissioners for their input.

-----  
**Mayor Auger** [18:50:21](#) said that inasmuch as this is the last meeting for Commissioners Hallstrom and Newton, she would like to give thanks for their service to the community during their terms on the Planning Commission. She told them she appreciated everything they did for the citizens and the City and expressed hope that in the future they would still be willing to help out in some other capacity.  
 -----  
 -----

**ADJOURNMENT:** By motion of **Commissioner Newton** and second by **Commissioner Hallstrom** the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Jean Gallegos, Administrative Assistant to the  
 Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held November 8, 2005.